

45
R52

R. N.

62

[1]

**AN
ANSWER
TO A
PAMPHLET**

INTITLED
*A Vindication of Sir Tho. Player, and those
Loyal Citizens concerned with him.*

**ARE
A REPLY**

**TO
A SPEECH made by Sir Tho. Player.**

By H. B. Citizen of London.

THe said H. B. for further Answer taken to the Exceptions in the said Vindication, answers and says, That the said Sir T. P. might as reasonably have taken H. B. for a Jew, as a Priest or Papist, there being nothing in his Answer, from which any such Conclusion can be drawn from the Premises. But it's observable, that any person that asserts the King's Legal Prerogative, and the established Religion, must be a Papist, without any contradiction whatever. And I must also observe, That the detecting and suppressing the Popish Plot, (in the opinion of the Phanaticks) cannot be effected by the present Govern-

A

ment,

352

ment, without their assistance, (whether requir'd or not.) But the Water being disturb'd, they put in their Hooks, Baits and Nets, to try whether they can catch the Filth, (that is to say, the Government.) And 'tis observable, that there is a Sect of men, whose Ambition, Jenkine, Faction, or pretended blinde Zeal, will never be contented with the best of Governments, which ours is, under a qualified Monarchy, unless they themselves be at Helm steering.

Surely this Vindicator cannot have so little Logick, as to suppose it was ever understood, that Parliaments or Courts of Judicature, could ever be intended as Routs and unlawful Assemblies: He would make Sir T. P. leading up his men like these, which not being according to Law, I affirm, may be reasonably accounted so. But to make it not so, Sir T. P. had two designs in it; one, to show his Attendants, whom he would have to vouch Jealousies and Fears for him: the other, to vote for Mr. J. to be a Peticioner-Sheriff, so as with that Authority to make his Faction Party the stronger. But the true Loyal Citizens, not so in title, as you title yourselves, were the greater number.

I expected to have met with Sir T. P. at the Meeting of the Licutenancy, on the 18th of this Month, with half a score of his *Men of Sense*; but because he was prohibited from bringing great numbers with him, he thought fit to wave it: Or else Sir T. P. and those persons were so employed in writing a Vindication for those Loyal Citizens, that they could not spare time: It being better to rail at a Church of England man, by calling him Sawcy Jesuit, and more ill Names than are yet invented at *Billingsgate*, than to be rendred Idle and Officious.

I could wish that his Club would consider Law, as well as Faction, and they might square their actions more discreetly. For how impudently doth this Vindicator affirm, that the City of London is not altogether tyed

tyed up by those Acts, &c. and that the City have the command of their Militia? and instances, That Burgers of all Cities in the world have the command of them. This is denied, for that there are no Cities, unless under Commonwealths (which we are not under the Tyranny of yet) have that command. But if it had been so, what is that to our Law established? Where by all the Acts, the Militia is declared to be absolutely in the Power of the King. And I am sure no person durst have said the contrary, but one that would favour Rebellion, so soon as an opportunity offers it self.

I must make bold once more to assert, that the keeping up the Guards of the City is a vast expence to the poor of the City, and tends much to the impoverishing of them. But our Vindicator says, *Volenti non fit injuria*, not considering it's against Law. But if he considered the use of them, he might finde them useless, and against Reason too. But the *Patron*, as he terms him, could once affirm, That the King having Guards for his person, was against Law. Let any man therefore Judge of the Vindicator's Principles, *Ex pede Herculem*. Not forgetting *The good old Cause*. It's commendable in Sir T. P. to cloak the old grudge so, to place his Revenge under a cloak of Publick Safety, and for the good of the City.

I must declare, it's some reflection upon the City, to have made choice of Factionous Persons to be our principal Officers in the City, and to place them in the Publique Offices. But it so hapned, it might not appear so to us then: But upon discovery, the City is ready enough to set such persons aside. Neither do I know how to reconcile the matter, for one that's Chamberlain of London to be a Parliament-man, because of the unlimitedness of that Priviledge; which, if made use of, may tend to the ruine of many Orphans and other persons, that are forced to give credit to this Publick Trust. *Abundans Cautela non nocet*. Without that there is any matter or thing

thing material for this Respondent to make Answer unto, &c.

And this Respondent doth demur in Law to the Vindicator, for that he being a Freeborn Citizen, and one of the Church of England as now by Law established, ought not to lye under the scurrilous Names in the said Pamphlet mentioned, and hereto annexed; but ought to have them expunged, and ought to have his Cost and Charges, &c.

N. R. I must make bold once more to tell you, that the

The Scurrilous Names mentioned in the said Pamphlet, to which the Answer hath relation.

<i>Saucie and dangerous Pamphleter,</i>	<i>His Mother the old Whore of Rome,</i>
<i>Priesthood,</i>	<i>Unworthy Respondent,</i>
<i>Scurrilous Libeller,</i>	<i>Daring Pamphleter,</i>
<i>Ghostly Citizen of Rome,</i>	<i>Incorrigible Libeller, and villainous Varlet,</i>
<i>Popish in Masquerade,</i>	<i>Scavenger,</i>
<i>Tranterous Make-bates,</i>	<i>Serpent,</i>
<i>Popish Butcher,</i>	<i>Rascally harking Scribler,</i>
<i>Spawn of Judas,</i>	<i>Petty Fogger,</i>
<i>Infamous Incendiary,</i>	<i>Popish Ruffin.</i>
<i>Impudent,</i>	

P I N I S.